

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Claims 15-17 and 21 are currently pending in this application. Claim 15 has been amended. Claim 22 has been canceled. The subject matter of claim 22 has been added to claim 15. No new matter has been added.

**Official Notice**

In the response mailed on August 7, 2009, Applicant requested, under MPEP 2143.03, that the Examiner provide documentary evidence substantiating the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice. Rather than providing the requested documentary evidence, the pending Office Action mailed on December 3, 2009 refers to portions of the Fosdick reference that allegedly substantiate the Office's belief. However, page 4 of the Office Action plainly states that the Fosdick reference **does not teach** disabling the emulated operating system as claimed. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the Examiner has not provided documentary evidence to substantiate the Examiner's assertion of Office Notice. Applicant once again respectfully requests that the Examiner provide this documentary evidence as required by MPEP 2143.03.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 15-17 and 21 stand rejected as allegedly being obvious in view of "VM/CMS Handbook for Programmers, Users and Managers" (Fosdick) and the Examiner's Official Notice.

Claim 15, as amended, recites connecting a memory device to a host computer having an original operating system stored on a storage device of the host computer and a host processor, wherein the original operating system is executing on the host processor and selecting a secondary operating system to be emulated from multiple emulated operating systems stored on the connected memory device.

Fosdick discloses a user using a dumb terminal connected to a mainframe. The mainframe simulates a computer for the user of the dumb terminal (Fosdick, p. 13). However, every component of the simulated computer is a component of the mainframe. Fosdick does not disclose connecting a memory device to the mainframe, where the memory device stores a secondary operating system to be emulated. Nor could the Fosdick system be modified in this way, since the user in Fosdick uses the dumb terminal to interact with the mainframe. The combination of Fosdick and the Official Notice also fails to teach or suggest this feature.

Claim 15, as amended, also recites routing input/output signals through the secondary operating system and disabling, by the operating environment emulator, the secondary operating system in response to an input/output signal being routed to the original operating system.

Page 4 of the Office Action acknowledges that Fosdick does not teach disabling the secondary operating system. However, the Office Action takes Official Notice that it would allegedly be obvious to a person of skill in the art for a user "to virtually or physically disconnect a guest computer from the host computer as a matter of choice." As noted above, Applicant respectfully requests that documentary evidence be provided to substantiate this assertion.

Furthermore, even if the noticed fact is proper, the combination of Fosdick and the Official Notice does not render the amended claim 15 obvious. Fosdick teaches several built-in ways for a user of a guest operating system to interface with the host operating system (e.g., p. 107 of Fosdick). As amended, claim 15 recites disabling, by the operating environment emulator, the emulated operating system in response to an input/output signal being routed to the original operating system (emphasis added). The combination of Fosdick and the Official Notice does not teach this feature. The Official Notice alleges that it would be obvious for a user to disconnect a guest computer from a host computer as a matter of choice (Office Action, p. 4, emphasis added). Neither Fosdick nor the Official Notice teaches "disabling, by the operating environment emulator, the secondary operating system in response to an input/output signal being routed to the original operating system" as claimed.

For the reasons stated above, the combination does not teach or suggest the features of the amended claim 15. Claims 16, 17, and 21 depend upon claim 15 and are therefore patentable over the combination as well. Applicant

respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

**SUMMARY**

If the Examiner determines that the prompt allowance of these claims can be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Lucinda Price at (408) 545-7194.

Please charge any additional fees under 37 CFR §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.20 and 1.21 that may be required to maintain pendency of the present application, or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-3781.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: February 1, 2010

/Joseph W. Sosinski/  
Joseph W. Sosinski  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 62,807

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040